



## **A Study of Influence of Mess Environment on Academic Achievement of Mess Living Post Graduates Students**

**Shilpi Roy Choudhury**

Ex-Student of Department of Education, University of Kalyani

Kalyani, Nadia, West Bengal, India, 741235

Email: [shilpi.edu90@gmail.com](mailto:shilpi.edu90@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** The study aimed on four objectives. First objective was to study the mess environment. Second was to identify the components. Third and fourth objectives were to identify the difference between urban and rural students and identify the difference between girls and boys students. 200 samples were selected through purposive sampling from the total population. Out of sixteen null hypotheses eleven null hypotheses were accepted and five null hypotheses were rejected after the statistical analysis and interpretation of the score.

**Keywords:** Influence, Mess, Post Graduate Students

### **INTRODUCTION:**

Housing is human's one of the primary demands. Due to population explosion, commercial housing has been established in many parts of the society on the basis of the payment and there is also an inadequate housing problem in the field of education.

Students are most important asset of schools, colleges and universities. There is no existence of schools, colleges, universities without students. At present, the zeal of the students in higher education is remarkable. Many students are get admitted to every year and every university for higher education. Due to the lack of universities, students from a huge distance from their home have to stay have to stay in university hostel or commercial hostel or private accommodation. This private accommodation is called Mess in west Bengal. The success of student academic achievement depends on factors such as intelligence, personal abilities, peers, institutional and living environment etc.

The ambience or environment of habitats, such as house, hostels etc., have an impact on academic achievement of the students. Here environment means the physical and social part.

Adams, T.A. (n.d.), showed in his research that poor housing condition influenced over academic achievement.

Swanepoel, A. (2014), showed, the physical environment the students find themselves are campus residences or other forms of accommodation such as their parents' home or student houses. These environments have positive or negative influences on their academic success. Students studying from home identified it as a positive influence. The home environment is more often than not more conducive to studying.

On the other hand, students staying in campus residence noted that this environment is not always contributing to academic success. The noise in residence as well as roommates has a negative influence on the students and also influences their motivation negatively. Given this points the campus residence environment is not always conducive to studying.

Irfan, M. and Khan, S.(2012), showed their research report that learning facility, communication proper guidance and interaction influenced as condition of living environment on academic achievement. Iftikar, A. and Ajmal, A.(n.d.), found in his research that drug usage has a negative impact on the male students. Zahir Khan's (2012)

finding says that the discrimination in a Hostel environment negatively influenced the Academic achievement.

**EMERGENCE OF THE PROBLEM:** At present the euphoria of mess system and the eagerness of the students to live in a mess is enough to look after. On the other hand, in the previous researches many works on the academic achievement and hostel environment has been done. Among the work done on the mess environment, the correlation has been looked after most of the time. It is rarely been seen if there are any differences between gender and location are rarely been seen. As this type of work is not seen in west Bengal, the researcher expressed her interest.

To study on this background, some students around the courtyard of University of Kalyani have been taken. Thus, the problem of the study run as, "A Study of Influence of Mess Environment on Academic Achievement of Mess Living Post Graduate Students.

**REVIEW:**

**Mersha Y, Bishaw A, Teague F** (2013) Factors Affecting Female Students' Academic Achievement At Bahir Dar University. The researcher has taken this title in his research. The main objectives of the their study were: To investigate the on campus and off campus factors responsible for female students' low academic performance and consequently high attrition. The major findings were: There exists a significant correlation among the support from teachers, support from friends, problems female students encounter in higher learning institutions, and their entrance exam results with their University GPA. The regression analysis has pulled out all the above variables as important predictors of female students' academic performance (University GPA). External factors such Disco and traditional Music Houses have detracted females from their persistence on academic work.

**Kavutha, M.J.** (2015), Influence Of Drug Use On Academic Performance Among Secondary School Students In Matinyani District, Kenya. The researcher has taken this title in his present research.

The main objectives of the study were: To identify the influence of drug use on academic performance among secondary school students Matinyani district. To establish whether drug use affect students discipline and interest in learning among secondary school students in Matinyani district. The major findings were: The use of drug influenced students' academic performance leading to poor academic performance. It also further influences students discipline and lead to increase in indiscipline case among students.

**Araujo, P.D., Murray, J.**(2010) , Estimating The Effects Of Dormitory Living On Student Performance. The main objectives of the study were: To find out the impact of dormitory living on Student Performance. In the research the researcher has found important things. The major findings were: living on campus increase GPA by between 0.19 to 0.97. that is the estimate for the degree of important to student performance caused by living on campus ranges between one fifth to one full tellen grades.

**Araujo, P.D., Murray J, Colorado, C.**(2010), Estimating The Effects Of Dormitory Living On Student Performance. The researcher has taken this title in his present research. The main objectives of the study were: To identify Many large universities require freshman to live in dormitories on the basis that living on campus leads to better classroom performance and lower drop out incidence. To identify large universities also provide a number of academic services in dormitories such as tutoring and student organizations that encourage an environment condusive to learning. A survey was administered to college students at a large state school to determine what impact dormitory living has on student performance. We use a handful of instrumental variable strategies to account for the possibly endogenous decision to live on campus. The major findings were: They find a robust result across model specifications and estimation techniques that on average, living

on campus increases GPA by between 0.19 to 0.97. The estimate for the degree of improvement to student performance caused by living on campus ranges between one-of-fifth to one full letter grade.

**Etikan, I. Bala, K., Babatope, O., And Others, (2017)**, Influence of Residential Setting on Student Outcome. The main objectives of the study were: To find out relationship between students' accommodation location on their academic performance. To find out relationship between students' accommodation location and their gender. To find out relationship between students' accommodation location and their age. Various researchers have attempted to investigate the roles. In his research the researcher has found important things that is There is no significance difference in the academic performance of the students residing on campus and those residing outside the school environment. Gender and age classifications were discovered to exert some influence on the choice of student accommodation preference.

**Swenson Goguen, L. M., Hiester, M.A., Nordstrom, A.H. (2010-2011)**, Associations Among Peer Relationships, Academic Achievement, And Persistence In College. The main objectives of the study were : To find out the positive relationship between peer relationship and academic achievement. Find out the relationship between attachment behaviour and academic achievement. To find out the relationship between peer conflict and academic achievement. In his research, the major findings were : Having a trustworthy and loyal friend was associated with higher GPA during the first college semester trust and loyalty between peers was a key factor in the academic achievement of first-year college students positive associations between relationship quality and persistence several friendship variables seemed indirectly related to student persistence via academic achievement. The conflict with a best college friend also was negatively associated with student persistence, but after accounting for GPA the association was no longer significant.

**Saint Mary's College of California, Factors That Impact Students Success, Recent Analysis Of TUG Students Success An Investigation Into The 2005-2009 Cohort By EDUVENTURE (2010)**, social, academic, financial, environmental and demographic or psychographics variables effects academic achievement. Among these variable social satisfactions, satisfaction with housing facilities or supports, off campus social interaction are found significant from social variable.

The above studies revealed that some of them dealt with one or more dimension of living environment. Some other dealt with correlation. Beside some made developmental studies. No such work was found in west Bengal to be conducted on the influence of Mess environment on academic achievement. So the present researcher intended to make a study on the above mention problem. The title was "A Study of Influence of Mess Environment on Academic Achievement of Mess Living Post Graduate Students."

#### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:**

- To study the mess environment
- Identify the components
- Identify the difference between urban and rural students.
- Identify the difference between girls and boys students.

#### **Statement of the assumption:**

It was assumed that there would be difference of influence of mess environment on academic achievement among the population. It was also assumed that there would be difference of influence of mess environment on academic achievement between rural post graduate students and urban post graduate students.

**Statement of the hypothesis:**

- <sup>o</sup>H<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference of internal facility between boys and girls.  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference of learning facility between boys and girls.  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference of interaction with roommates between boys and girls  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference of interaction with other resident or boarder between boys and girls  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference of discrimination between boys and girls  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference of addiction between boys and girls.  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference of recreation between boys and girls  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference of violence between boys and girls  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference of internal facility between rural students and urban students.  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference of learning facility between rural students and urban students.  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>11</sub>: There is no difference of interaction with roommates between rural students and urban students.  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>12</sub>: There is no difference of interaction with other resident or boarder between rural students and urban students.  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>13</sub>: There is no difference of discrimination between rural students and urban students.  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>14</sub>: There is no difference of addiction between rural students and urban students.  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>15</sub>: There is no difference of recreation between rural students and urban students.  
<sup>o</sup>H<sub>16</sub>: There is no difference of violence between rural students and urban students.

**METHOD OF THE STUDY****SAMPLE:**

From the total population the researcher selected only two hundred (200) mess living post graduate students as sample for the study. The distribution of the sample according to gender and strata is shown in Table-1 and Table- 2 respectively.

**Table-1:** Distribution of sample population according to gender

| Gender |       | Total |
|--------|-------|-------|
| Boys   | Girls |       |
| 100    | 100   | 200   |

**Table -2:** Distribution of sample population according to strata

| Strata         |                | Total |
|----------------|----------------|-------|
| Rural students | Urban students |       |
| 112            | 88             | 200   |

**TOOLS:**

To measure academic achievement the researcher has considered the score percentage of the last semester examination of post graduate students. On the other hand, to measure the influence of mess environment on academic achievement the researcher prepared questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of 40 questions of statement on various environmental, psychological and sociological aspects. Present researcher identified eight major dimensions for measuring influence of mess environment. These eight dimensions are internal facility, learning facility, communication with roommate, communication with other resident (boarder), discrimination, addiction, recreation and violence. An expert validated the construct of the questionnaire.

The response for each item or statement were expressed in terms of five alternative categories such as Strongly Agree , Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree.

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Determination of the significance of difference in the mean score of the boys and girls students by t –test

**Table - 3**

| Dimension                          | Gender | Number | Mean  | S.D. | t value | Significant level         |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|------|---------|---------------------------|
| Internal facility                  | Boys   | 100    | 24.06 | 3.96 | .69     | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Girls  | 100    | 24.47 | 4.47 |         |                           |
| Learning facility                  | Boys   | 100    | 16.36 | 2.76 | .66     | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Girls  | 100    | 16.65 | 3.45 |         |                           |
| Communication with room mates      | Boys   | 100    | 18.09 | 3.48 | .23     | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Girls  | 100    | 18.21 | 3.82 |         |                           |
| Communication with other residents | Boys   | 100    | 16.10 | 3.25 | .49     | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Girls  | 100    | 16.32 | 3.19 |         |                           |
| Discrimination                     | Boys   | 100    | 15.07 | 3.44 | 1.50    | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Girls  | 100    | 15.80 | 3.44 |         |                           |
| Addiction                          | Boys   | 100    | 15.61 | 4.34 | 1.48    | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Girls  | 100    | 16.38 | 3.13 |         |                           |
| Recreation                         | Boys   | 100    | 13.51 | 2.94 | 1.17    | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Girls  | 100    | 13.02 | 2.98 |         |                           |
| Violence                           | Boys   | 100    | 9.50  | 2.13 | 2.96**  | Significant or rejected   |
|                                    | Girls  | 100    | 10.49 | 2.57 |         |                           |

\*significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* significant at the 0.01 level.

Determination of the significance of difference in the mean score of the rural students and urban students by t –test

**Table - 4**

| Dimension                          | Strata         | Number | Mean  | S.D. | t value | Significant level         |
|------------------------------------|----------------|--------|-------|------|---------|---------------------------|
| Internal facility                  | Rural students | 112    | 25.08 | 4.22 | 1.2     | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Urban students | 88     | 24.36 | 4.21 |         |                           |
| Learning facility                  | Rural students | 112    | 16.29 | 2.99 | 1.09    | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Urban students | 88     | 16.77 | 3.26 |         |                           |
| Communication with room mates      | Rural students | 112    | 17.69 | 3.73 | 2.05*   | Significant or rejected   |
|                                    | Urban students | 88     | 18.74 | 3.47 |         |                           |
| Communication with other residents | Rural students | 112    | 15.89 | 3.17 | 1.6     | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Urban students | 88     | 16.61 | 3.25 |         |                           |
| Discrimination                     | Rural students | 112    | 15.79 | 3.45 | 1.66    | Insignificant or accepted |
|                                    | Urban students | 88     | 14.99 | 3.42 |         |                           |
| Addiction                          | Rural students | 112    | 15.33 | 3.96 | 2.96**  | Significant or rejected   |
|                                    | Urban students | 88     | 16.84 | 3.41 |         |                           |
| Recreation                         | Rural students | 112    | 14.05 | 3.01 | 4.58**  | Significant or rejected   |
|                                    | Urban students | 88     | 12.26 | 2.58 |         |                           |
| Violence                           | Rural students | 112    | 9.59  | 2.14 | 2.08*   | Significant or rejected   |
|                                    | Urban students | 88     | 10.30 | 2.57 |         |                           |

\*significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\* significant at the 0.01 level.

**INTERPRITATION OF RESULT:**

Interpretation of the significance of difference in mean scores (t-values)

 **$^{\circ}H_1$ :**

The corresponding t-value of  $^{\circ}H_1$  is .69 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of internal facility of mess environment between boys and girls.

 **$^{\circ}H_2$ :**

The corresponding t-value of  $^{\circ}H_2$  is .66 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of learning facility of mess environment between boys and girls.

 **$^{\circ}H_3$ :**

The corresponding t-value of  $^{\circ}H_3$  is .23 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of communication with roommates of mess environment between boys and girls.

 **$^{\circ}H_4$ :**

The corresponding t-value of  $^{\circ}H_4$  is .49 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of communication with other residents of mess environment between boys and girls.

 **$^{\circ}H_5$ :**

The corresponding t-value of  $^{\circ}H_5$  is 1.50 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of discrimination of mess environment between boys and girls.

 **$^{\circ}H_6$ :**

The corresponding t-value of  $^{\circ}H_6$  is 1.48 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of addiction of mess environment between boys and girls.

 **$^{\circ}H_7$ :**

The corresponding t-value of  $^{\circ}H_7$  is 1.17 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of recreation of mess environment between boys and girls.

 **$^{\circ}H_8$ :**

The corresponding t-value of  $^{\circ}H_8$  is 2.96 and the value is significant at 0.01 level. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is rejected.

So, there is significant difference of violence of mess environment between boys and girls.

 **$^{\circ}H_9$ :**

The corresponding t-value of  $^{\circ}H_9$  is 1.2 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of internal facility of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

 **$^{\circ}H_{10}$ :**

The corresponding t-value of  $^{\circ}H_{10}$  is 1.09 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of learning facility of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

**<sup>o</sup>H<sub>11</sub>:**

The corresponding t-value of <sup>o</sup>H<sub>11</sub> is 2.05 and the value is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is rejected.

So, there is significant difference of communication with roommates of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

**<sup>o</sup>H<sub>12</sub>:**

The corresponding t-value of <sup>o</sup>H<sub>12</sub> is 1.60 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of communication with other residents of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

**<sup>o</sup>H<sub>13</sub>:**

The corresponding t-value of <sup>o</sup>H<sub>13</sub> is 1.66 and the value is not significant. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is accepted.

So, there is no significant difference of discrimination of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

**<sup>o</sup>H<sub>14</sub>:**

The corresponding t-value of <sup>o</sup>H<sub>14</sub> is 2.96 and the value is significant at 0.01 level. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is rejected.

So, there is significant difference of addiction of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

**<sup>o</sup>H<sub>15</sub>:**

The corresponding t-value of <sup>o</sup>H<sub>15</sub> is 4.58 and the value is significant at 0.01 level. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is rejected.

So, there is significant difference of recreation of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

**<sup>o</sup>H<sub>16</sub>:**

The corresponding t-value of <sup>o</sup>H<sub>16</sub> is 2.08 and the value is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore the corresponding hypothesis is rejected.

So, there is significant difference of violence of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

**Finding and conclusion:**

The results obtained at the stage of analysis and the interpretations of the score are as follows-

There is significant difference of violence of mess environment between boys and girls.

There is significant difference of communication with roommates of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

There is significant difference of addiction of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

There is significant difference of recreation of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

There is significant difference of violence of mess environment between rural students and urban students.

**Reference:**

- Bomen, N.K., Bomen, G.L.(1999), Effects Of Crime And Violence In Neighborhoods And Schools On The School Behavior And Performance Of Adolescents, Journal of Adolescent Research,14(3),319-339. Retrieve from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0743558499143003>

- Iftikhar, A., and Ajmal, A.(2015), Qualitative Study Investigating The Impact of Hostel Life, E-Journal of International Journal of Emergency Mental Health and Human Resilience,17(2),511-515. Retrieve from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275329967\\_A\\_QUALITATIVE\\_STUDY\\_INVESTIGATING\\_THE\\_IMPACT\\_OF\\_HOSTEL\\_LIFE](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275329967_A_QUALITATIVE_STUDY_INVESTIGATING_THE_IMPACT_OF_HOSTEL_LIFE)
- Irfan, M., and Khan, S.(2012),Factors Affecting Students Academic Performance , E-journal of Global Journal of Management and Business Research,12(9),17-22. Retrieve from <https://www.gu.se/english/research/publication?publicationId=157715>
- Kavutha, M.J. (2015), Influence Of Drug Use On Academic Performance Among Secondary School Students In Matinyani District, Kenya, Inter National Journal of Scientific and Research Publication,5(11),726-731. Retrieve from <http://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-1115/ijsrp-p47107.pdf>
- Khan, Z.(2012), the factors affecting the students' performance: a case study of university of malakand, Pakistan, e- journal of city university research journal,3(1). Retrieve from [http://www.cityuniversity.edu.pk/curj/Journals/Journal/July%202012/3%20\(edu\).pdf](http://www.cityuniversity.edu.pk/curj/Journals/Journal/July%202012/3%20(edu).pdf)
- Swenson Goguen, L. M., Hiester, M.A., Nordstrom, A.H. (2010-2011), Associations Among Peer Relationships,Academic Achievement, And Persistence In College. Retrieve from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.2190/CS.12.3.d>

### Web source:

- Araujo, P.D., Murray, J.(2010) , Estimating The Effects Of Dormitory Living On Student Performance. Retrieve from [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1555892](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1555892)
- Etikan, I. Bala, K., Babatope, O., And Others, (2017), Influence of Residential Setting on Student Outcome. Retrieve from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3df9/976deef864ce41f4137b6203e5e298c31fec.pdf>
- Mersha, Y., Bishaw, A.,Telegue, F.(2013), Factors Affecting Female Students' Academic Achievement At Bahir Dar University. Retrieve from <http://home.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/cice/wp-content/uploads/publications/series/5-1/5-1-61.pdf>
- Saint Mary's College of California, EDUVENTURE (2010), Factors That Impact Students Success, Recent Analysis of TUG Students Success An Investigation Into The 2005-2009 Cohort. Retrieve from <https://www.stmarysca.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/files/FACTORSTHATIMPACTSTUDENTSUCCESS.pdf>
- Solorzano, D., Ceja, M., Yosso, T. (2000), Critical Race Theory , Racial Micro-aggression, Campus Racial Climate:The Experiences Of African College Students. Retrieve from <https://www.middlesex.mass.edu/RLOs/748/Critical-Race-Theory.pdf>



- Swanepoel, A.(2014), Factors Affecting Academic Success of First Year Occupational Therapy Students at the University of the Free State. Retrieve from <http://scholar.ufs.ac.za:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11660/2056/SwanepoelA.pdf?sequence=1>

